REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. In paragraph 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 13-18. The Applicants thank the Examiner.

In paragraph 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-7, 9, 12 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,292,193 to Perry et al. (hereinafter "Perry") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,016,152 to Dickie (hereinafter "Dickie"). In paragraph 4, the Examiner objects to claims 2, 3, 8, 10 and 11 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-7, 9, 12 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry in view of Dickie. Applicants respectfully traverse.

With respect to claims 1, 9 and 19, the Examiner states that Perry teaches receiving input information relating to polygon and texture data, but "does not teach morphing a texture reconstruction filter characteristic or an effective filter characteristic matches the texture reconstruction filter characteristic of a texture reconstruction filter used for coarse sampling." The Examiner claims that "Dickie discloses morphing (see Dickie, column 3 lines 58-65) a texture reconstruction filter characteristic (see Dickie, column 3 lines 36-42) and that an effective filter characteristic matches the texture reconstruction filter characteristic of a texture reconstruction filter used for coarse sampling (see Dickie, column 4 line 65 – column 5 line 4)."

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner ignored a limitation of claims 1, 9 and 19 in making the 103(a) rejection. A prior art reference (or references when combined) must

teach or suggest all the claim limitations, see MPEP 706.02(j). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Claims 1, 9 and 19 each state "receiving input information relating to polygon and texture data" and "morphing a texture reconstruction filter characteristic...based upon the input information." A close read of Dickie shows that it does not teach or suggest the limitation of "morphing...based upon the input information" relating to polygon and texture data as required by claims 1, 9 and 19. Rather, in Dickie, the filter modification is based on an independently defined effect or function. Thus, the filter modification in Dickie is not based upon the polygon and texture data.

Dickie teaches, the "[f]ilter modifier 105 receives a selected filter 120, a selected pixel 115...and data 130 indicating the effect to be applied to a source image 110. ***The filter modifier 105 modifies the selected filter 120 according to a relationship, defined by the effect 130***...to create a transformed filter" (col. 3, lines 36-42, emphasis added). Dickie further teaches that the process of determining a pixel value in a destination image "is ***determined according to non-uniform scaling***" which scaling "may include any deformation of the source image" including "sphere, ripple, twirl... or any deformation ***determined by a function*** from one plane to another plane" (col. 4 lines 17-35, emphasis added). Dickie states that the "***process starts...with selection of a special effect*** involving non-uniform scaling or arbitrary deformation of an image, ***which may be input to a computer", a "[p]redetermined special effect...stored in memory", or "selected according to user input into [the] computer"*** (col. 5, lines 8-16, emphasis added).

Thus, Dickie does not teach or suggest morphing based upon the input information relating to polygon and texture data as required by claims 1, 9 and 19. On the contrary, the effect or non-uniform scaling in Dickie is an independent function, distinct from and not based upon the polygon and texture data. Dickie requires that an effect or scaling to be applied to a source image must be separately defined and then applied to the pixel data. At no point in the disclosure of Dickie is there an express or implied teaching, or even suggestion, to morph a texture reconstruction filter based upon polygon and texture data.

When all words in claims 1, 9 and 19 are considered, it is clear that the combination of Perry and Dickie does not teach all elements of claims 1, 9 and 19. Because Dickie, whether taken alone or combined with Perry, fails to teach or suggest all claim limitations set forth in claims 1, 9 and 19, independent claims 1, 9 and 19 are not obvious and are thus allowable.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Claims 2-8 depend from and add further limitations onto allowable independent claim 1, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons advanced with respect to claim 1. Similarly, claims 10-12 depend from claim 9 and add further limitations, hence are allowable for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to claim 9.

Applicants request that the 103(a) rejections be withdrawn and the application advanced to issuance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that the rejections and objections in the Office Action of June 17, 2003 are fully overcome and that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Baskaran Vijayakumar et al.

Date: 9/11/03 By: Susan Yee

Susan Yee, Reg. No. 41,388
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2225 East Bayshore Road, Suite 200
Palo Alto, California 94303
Phone: (650) 812-3400
Fax: (650) 812-3444